

From: Tony Park
To: Alam, Parwez
Date: 11/16/2004 12:24:46 PM
Subject: Re: Assumptions from Bell Griffith Appraisal Report (12.03 acres on Velda Dairy Rd)

P.A.

These are issues that Paul, Jim Pilcher and our appraisers had concerns about in the assumptions used by the planner for Mr. Serpico when Paul was discussing the possible purchase. Paul was also concerned that the parcel was not large enough for the park improvements needed.

We will prepare the agenda to reject the purchase price.

Tony Park, P.E.
Director of Public Works
Leon County
850-488-8003
fax: 850-488-1260
tonyp@mail.co.leon.fl.us

Please note: Under Florida's Public Records laws, most written communications to or from county staff or officials regarding county business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communications may therefore be subject to public disclosure.

>>> David McDevitt 11/15/2004 6:04:11 PM >>>

P.A.,

We have completed a review of the land use and development potential assumptions (as outlined in the letter dated February 20, 2004 to Joseph Serpico from Luis Serna) utilized in the Bell Griffith Appraisal Report noted above.

The southern 6.44 acres (MOL) of the property in question is currently designated Residential Preservation (RP). Pursuant to Section 10-920, this portion of the property can only be developed with detached single family dwelling units. The assumptions used in the two development scenarios provided to Serpico, indicate that the minimum lot size for the southern RP component of the property would be .88 acres. This is consistent with the RP designation. Therefore, the assumption that seven (7) lots for single family homes could be development on the southern 6.44 acres of the property is correct. However, based on the shape of the property and the onsite pond with associated wetlands, the development of the southern portion may require the installation of a roadway with required storm water treatment thereby reducing the achievable density by one lot.

With regard to the northern 5.59 acres (MOL) of the property, the Serpico letter outlines two possible development scenarios based on the current Bradfordville Commercial Services (BCS) zoning designation and the applicable provisions of the Bradfordville Sector Plan. The Sector Plan implements a Commercial/Mixed Use Overlay Zone Two on this portion of the property. The overlay zone limits retail commercial development on this portion of the property until after 2010. However, office and other nonresidential uses including the storage use noted in the letter are allowed in the interim.

Under development option one noted in the letter, the proposal includes single family attached dwelling units at a density of 12 units per acre. This is consistent with the BCS zoning designation and the Sector Plan. However, it would appear that with the application of the applicable development standards for parking, buffering, landscaping, storm water management, and open space that the 67 dwelling unit number presented in the development scenario is not achievable based on the size of the parcel. Even with the possibility of providing off-site storm water management (on the RP component) it is estimated that the achievable density would probably be as much as 50% less than outlined in scenario one after demonstrating compliance with all applicable development standards.

Under scenario two for the northern portion of the property, the proposal includes up to 95,030 sq. ft of nonresidential uses (office and storage) on the 5.59 acres. These uses are allowed under both the BCS

designation and the Sector Plan. However, the intensity of development appears not to be achievable based on the applicable development standards. Specifically, under the provisions of the BCS district and the Overlay Zone established by the Sector Plan, nonresidential development is limited to 35% total impervious site coverage. This would limit the impervious (building, parking, sidewalks, etc.) allowed under option two to approximately 1.98 acres. Additionally, office buildings are limited to 10,000 sq. ft. in size. Even with proposed two story buildings of 10,000 sq. ft (office use on one floor and storage on the other) it would appear impossible to achieve the intensity proposed in development option two. This conclusion is further supported when you consider the associated parking requirements for the nonresidential uses and its impact on the overall impervious coverage limitation of 35%.

In summary, our review of the land use and development potential assumptions as outlined in the February 20, 2004-letter to Serpico from Serna that were used to formulate the appraisal noted above are as follows:

1. The land use and development potential assumptions for the southern RP-zoned portion of the property are basically correct.
2. The land use assumptions used for the two development scenarios outlined for the northern BCS-zoned portion of the property are basically correct. However, under both scenarios the density and/or intensity outlined in the resulting development scenarios would appear to be substantially over estimated. This conclusion is based on consideration of the impact of the applicable County LDRs and Sector Plan requirements including parking, landscaping, open space, buffering, impervious coverage limitations, and storm water management criteria on the development potential of the site.

I hope this provides the information that you need to assess the site's development potential. Please let me know if you need additional information or have questions.

David

PLEASE NOTE: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from county employees and county officials regarding county business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communications may be subject to public disclosure.

CC: Thiele, Herb